

REMARKS

Claims 1-39 were presented for examination and are pending. Claims 22-39 have been withdrawn. Claims 1-21 are rejected. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Objection To The Disclosure

Claim 12 is objected to because the term "seek" is unclear. The term "seek" has been deleted. Therefore the objection should be withdrawn.

The 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-21 are rejected as being unpatentable over Tong et al. in view of Grenon et al. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed in the attached Declaration, indeed a difference between Tong et al. and the present invention is that the applicant teaches correcting the defect by changing the thickness of the thin film coating in the vicinity of the defect. However, contrary to the Examiner's argument, Grenon et al. does not supply the missing element. The applicants' invention, as recited in claim 1, is directed to an EUVL mask, which must be a reflective mask. Grenon et al is directed to a transmissive mask. As discussed in the attached Declaration, the repair methods of Grenon et al. will not work on a reflective mask. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the EUVL mask is a reflective mask. Claims 2-21 depend from claim 1.


Therefore the rejection should be withdrawn.

Conclusions

It is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance based on claims 1-21 in view of the amendments thereto and the foregoing comments.

If any impediments remain to prompt allowance of the case, please contact the undersigned at 808-270-1011.

Respectfully submitted,


John P. Wooldridge
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,725

Dated: October 2, 2003